

(6)

gations of the contract were plain and specific and the consideration for the testator's promise was valuable. There seems to be no question that the complainant performed her duties not only from October, 1923, until June 20, 1929, but also thenceforth until the time of Davidge's death in June, 1940. In this case it is not the value of the thing promised that entitles the promisee to a specific performance, but the promisee's complete performance. It has been pointed out by the Court of Appeals that the parties to a contract are free to fix any form of lawful compensation as a reward for the doing of a lawful thing. *Marden vs. Scott*, 154 Md. 414, 418. Nevertheless, we observe that Mrs. Baumgardner was unquestionably entitled to compensation for her faithful services; and, according to the stipulation of the parties, the properties in question, although improved by 16 houses, are assessed at a total of only \$14,610. Throughout a period of nearly 17 years, during which she paid approximately four thousand dollars for rent, the complainant performed the following services: (1) served Davidge three meals a day, which at a low estimate of a dollar a day would have been worth over six thousand dollars; (2) washed and mended his clothes; (3) offered her companionship and treated him as a member of her family; (4) assisted him by waiting on customers in the store; (5) searched for him at frequent intervals in unattractive places in the city when he became drunk, and brought him back home; and (6) performed menial duties when he was drunk. Bernard R. Baumgardner, who swore that Davidge became drunk about eight